



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The position of those who deny the historicity of Jesus has not been materially strengthened by Mr. Robertson's book. It presents no new data of importance and it follows in general the line of argument commonly employed by representatives of this school. The early Christian writings still extant in the New Testament are set aside without any effort to test their reliability by the application of a modern scientific historical criticism. In place of constructive data drawn from these substantial documents readers are offered a congeries of "inferablys" and "manifestlys," supported by only intangible evidence often of more than dubious worth and derived from sources that have no actual historical connection with early Christianity.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

BOOKS ON BABYLONIA AND ITS RELATION TO WESTERN ASIA:

THE EMPIRE OF THE AMORITES. ALBERT T. CLAY. Yale Oriental Series. Vol. VI. Researches. The Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. 192.

RECORDS FROM UR AND LARSA DATED IN THE LARSA DYNASTY. ETTALENE M. GRICE, Ph.D. Yale Oriental Series. Vol. V. Babylonian Texts. Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. 56. Plates LXXXVIII.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE LARSA DYNASTY. ETTALENE M. GRICE, Ph.D. Yale Oriental Series. Vol. IV, 1. Researches. Yale University Press. 1919. Pp. 43.

In 1909 Professor A. T. Clay issued *Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites*, in which he maintained that our whole conception of the cultural relations of western Asia must be changed. The commonly accepted view that the Semitic peoples had their home in the Arabian peninsula from which they spread over the more fertile countries to the east, north, and west, he held to be entirely erroneous. Not only did he maintain in that volume that Israel's culture was not of Babylonian origin, but on the contrary that the culture of Semitic Babylonia either originated in the west or had a long period of development there before it was carried into Babylonia. In other words he maintained that the dissemination of the northern Semitic peoples did not move from the east to the west, but from the west to the east. Now, ten years later, he issues another volume whose avowed purpose is to assemble all the facts that bear upon the history and religion of the western Semites, to substantiate further the claims made for the great antiquity of the Amorites, to show that Ur of the Chaldees was the capital of the Amorite empire, and to demonstrate that the generally accepted theory of the Arabian origin of the Semites is utterly baseless.

With acumen and learning Professor Clay assembles evidence from inscriptions scattered over the whole of western Asia, and conjures up the vision of a great Amorite or western Semitic empire, which he believes extended from the southern portion of the middle Euphrates on the east to northern Syria and the Gulf of Akabah on the west, an empire which immediately preceded Hittite ascendancy, having existed in the third, fourth, and fifth millenniums B.C. He maintains that it was a political unity, in which country and capital had the same name, and with this hypothesis in mind he searches for the center from which it was governed. This he finds in the middle Euphrates kingdom of Mari, or Mara of the earlier inscriptions. The city Mari was, according to Professor Clay, "powerful enough to weld together the Semitic peoples of this region into a great nation and give it the name Amurru"; it was the home of the Chaldean antediluvian mythological kings, at whose head stands Aloras; it was the home of the Biblical patriarch Abraham, for, according to St. Stephen (Acts 7 2, 4), Ur of the Chaldees was in Mesopotamia. The hegemony of Mari or Ur he believes to have been established long before the time of Sargon and to have been brought to an end by Hammurabi.

Evidence for the existence of this empire, its history, and its civilization is sought in the influence which it exerted upon other peoples as revealed in the names of countries, cities, temples, deities, and persons. For example, in the names of the antediluvian patriarchs preserved by Berossus he finds Amorite name-elements and in five or six of them the name of the Amorite deity Uru. It may be remarked in passing that he considers the Babylonian and Hebrew lists of antediluvian patriarchs as having nothing in common except the fact that each list consists of ten names and the tenth is the diluvian hero. The inference that Amurru furnished Babylonia with its early inhabitants rests upon Sumerian and Akkadian inscriptions, in which it is difficult at the present state of our knowledge, and frequently quite impossible, to distinguish with certainty between Sumerian and Semitic names. This difficulty is not minimized by Professor Clay; but the fact that a name is written in Sumerian he does not regard as proof that its pronunciation was Sumerian. Hence he is able to regard most of the names of the earliest kings of Kish, Erech, and Ur as Semitic, or more specifically west Semitic or Amorite. The fact that the name of the fifth king of Erech, Gish-bil-ga-mesh (Gilgamesh) contains "mesh" or "mesh" as a name-element serves in his opinion to identify the Gilgamesh epic with the Lebanon district. Ea-bani or Enkidu he regards as an Amorite; the cedar forest which surrounded the stronghold of Humbaba he locates with "reasonable certainty"

in the Lebanon mountains instead of in Elam; the mountain Mashu he identifies with Mount Hermon; and Humbaba himself he regards as the earliest Amorite known by name. That the Gilgamesh epic had its origin in the west follows necessarily if the above premises could be regarded as substantiated. Professor Clay has long contended that the names of the rulers of the dynasty of Isin show that they were Amorites, and the complete list of the kings of Larsa which has been recently recovered and published by Professor Clay leads to the same conclusion. It is now generally conceded that the rulers of Isin, Larsa, and the first dynasty of Babylon gained their place as the result of a great racial movement which brought western Semites down the Euphrates and into southern Babylonia. Professor Clay's contention that Assyria received its Semitic population at about this same time as an offshoot of the eastward movement of Amorites is gaining general assent. The business and legal documents found in Cappadocia written in a Semitic language and in the cuneiform script are believed by some to be of Assyrian and by others of Babylonian origin. Professor Clay regards most of the proper names in these Cappadocian tablets as Amoritic, but he does not venture to suggest to what extent western Semites moved into Asia Minor. Neither is he able to assert that the Amorites influenced Egypt politically in the early period; but he calls attention to the Semitic loan-words which were introduced into Egypt at the same time that the western Semitic dynasties were establishing themselves in southern Babylonia, and suggests that it is possible that one or more dark periods in Egyptian history are to be explained by encroachments of Amorites.

Since the Amorites left no written records, knowledge of their language is dependent upon a study of personal names preserved in the inscriptions of neighboring peoples. This has convinced Professor Clay that the Amorite language was the parent language of Semitic Babylonian, Aramean, Hebrew, and possibly Arabic. He also maintains that they had a script of their own, which was used upon perishable material. He argues that had they used the Babylonian cuneiform script for writing their Amorite language, as the Hittites, Mitannians, and Vannic people did for their languages, excavations would have yielded some evidence of it — although excavations have not been conducted in the land of the Amorites except in Palestine. In the writer's opinion he might have strengthened his argument for the early appearance of a western Semitic system of writing by referring to the report of Wen-Amon <sup>1</sup> (ca. 1100 B.C.) concerning his journey to

<sup>1</sup> See Breasted, *History of Egypt* (1905), pp. 213-218, and Kittel's discussion in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. I, 178.

Byblos, by reference to the fact that Cyprus and Crete had their own system of writing, and that the ostraca from Samaria show that writing in Palestine had a long history before 900 B.C.

A further means by which Professor Clay seeks to substantiate the thesis of the antiquity of Amorite civilization is in claiming that the prehistoric legends which the western Semites and Babylonians had in common originated in the west and that the worship of western gods spread over a wide area but exerted its chief influence upon the Babylonian pantheon. It has long been suspected that such gods as Adad and Dagan are of west Semitic origin; but Anu, Ashur, Ishtar, Ea, Enlil, Marduk, Nabu, Nergal, Nin-IB or Inurta, Shamash, Sin, and many others are likewise claimed for the west, until "it is of course apparent that the trend of what precedes is toward regarding practically everything that is Semitic Babylonian as having its origin in Amurru."

Professor Clay believes that there is no evidence in favor of the theory generally accepted by scholars that Arabia is the center from which the Semitic dispersion occurred. He declines to discuss the hypothesis of the ultimate origin of the Semitic race as being a problem which belongs to anthropology, and chooses rather to confine himself to historical and archæological data and traditions. He points out that Hebrew tradition regards Mesopotamia as the cradle of mankind, and Armenia, the country in which the ark rested, as the second home of the race. The tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis show that it was the view of the biblical writer that the Arabian nations emanated from the north, and "their opportunity for knowing at least something about the early history of the Arameans — that is, their own ancient history — was at least greater than that enjoyed by those modern scholars who begin the history of Abram and the Hebrews with the exodus of the Arameans from Arabia, or even Egypt, in the latter half of the second millennium B.C." Although he recognizes that the burden of proof rests with those who maintain that the Semitic dispersion occurred from Arabia as its center, his argument against the theory is based chiefly on the following considerations: (a) If in ancient times water was more abundant in Arabia than at present, one can readily understand how tribes with great flocks would pass into it from the north. (b) An examination of the names of gods in Arabic inscriptions and of personal names throughout the Semitic field ought, *ex hypothesi*, to show Arabic influence, which he finds not to be the case. (c) The fact that the Arabic language preserves the characteristics of Semitic speech more fully than other Semitic tongues is taken to indicate that this migration from

the north into Arabia took place before the modifications which differentiate the various Semitic languages from each other had occurred. He concludes therefore that our present knowledge is insufficient for the formation of any theory in regard to the original seat of the Semites.

The present writer is unable to accept many of the conclusions arrived at by Professor Clay. Some of them he himself puts forth as tentative and subject to revision; many are ingenious, and all will stimulate thought and discussion. Doubtless cautious scholars will feel that he has carried his theory much too far, although it is becoming increasingly clear as additional facts are brought to light from excavations that the west influenced the east at an earlier period and more constantly than has been supposed hitherto, and that the cultural relations of the whole of western Asia were more complicated than was formerly deemed possible.

Dr. Grice's publication of the cuneiform text of two hundred and fifty-three tablets of the Yale Babylonian Collection, accompanied by an introduction and the usual indexes, is an imposing volume. About half of the tablets were found at Muqayyar, the site of Ur, and are the "first considerable number to be published from that site." The remainder are from Senkereh, which is the site of the ancient city of Larsa, the biblical Ellasar. They are legal contracts and temple records, written for the most part in the Sumerian language, their chief importance being due to the historical matter contained in the date formulae. To mention the fact that Miss Grice is an apt pupil of so able an editor of cuneiform texts as Professor Clay is sufficient assurance that the text is a faithful and skillful reproduction of the original. A perusal of the list of personal names might at first give the impression that the inhabitants of southern Babylonia at that time all bore Semitic names; but cross references show that names are to some extent listed under both the Sumerian and the Semitic forms. Tested by a page taken at random from the index, the references are found to be reliable with only an occasional error. It is unfortunate that it is not the fashion to give the figures on the seal impressions of dated tablets, for they are valuable in indicating the style of seal used at the time the document was written, the seal impression being contemporaneous with the writing. Neither time nor pains have been spared in getting out a large piece of work which is exceedingly well executed.

From date-formulae of texts published in the above mentioned volume, from unpublished texts of the Yale Collection, and from other texts previously published, Miss Grice had collected and arranged

chronologically all of the facts known in regard to the dynasty of Larsa. Just as her work was nearly completed she received an advance copy from M. Thureau-Dangin of a prism in the Louvre containing the date-formulæ of the Larsa dynasty. She had the satisfaction of seeing conclusions at which she had previously and independently arrived confirmed by this new and unimpeachable evidence, but it was no longer necessary to publish the entire study. Since Yale texts furnish some additional material for the restitution of broken formulæ and of the middle portion of the prism covering a period of fifty-four years, she has published "the part of that study which comprises a list of all the formulæ of the dynasty that are known, so arranged that they may be conveniently used by scholars who are using the Larsa Dynasty material."

Her explanation of the difficult phrase *šag-mu ki-18* as a reference to the duration of the long conflict which raged between Rim-Sin and the army of Isin, is both clever and reasonable. A comparison of the transliteration of the date formulæ of the Louvre prism by M. Thureau-Dangin with that of Miss Grice emphasizes the need of a uniform system of transliteration which shall be followed by all scholars. Miss Grice's excellent study of the chronology of the Larsa dynasty is indispensable to any one working in that period.

MARY I. HUSSEY.

MT. HOLYOKE COLLEGE.

THE PEOPLE'S FAITH IN THE TIME OF WYCLIF. BERNARD LORD MANNING.  
Cambridge University Press (England). 1919. Pp. 155. 2s. 6d.

This little book belies its appearance, which is that of the ordinary prize essay published in a university. At best one may expect that such productions contain a certain amount of information collected with or without method, and perhaps a useful bibliography. But Mr. Manning's book is more than this; it is a real contribution of ideas by a thoughtful man. It may be paid the compliment of hostile criticism by those who are unable to accept its conclusions, which is a high commendation for a young scholar to deserve. The merit of a good style, relieved by terse and epigrammatic utterances, adds to the attractiveness of the book, the object of which is to let the popular writers of the age of Wyclif give their testimony as to the religious condition of England at the time. Mr. Manning wisely declines to begin with a pretentious bibliography, containing much that has been written and little that has been read. He prefers to speak of his "List